

FSW REVIEW PANEL SUMMARY REPORT TEMPLATE

Notes/Instructions (delete this page before delivery)

This document is a template intended for use by Code 582 (Flight Software Branch) personnel as the basis for a mission-specific Flight Software Review Panel Summary Report.

The following style conventions are used throughout:

Text in this style (style name “Normal”) is used for text that is equally applicable to all Summary Reports and should be included without modification.

[Text in this style (style name “TAILORING ADVICE”) is advice on how to tailor the text in any specific section, or an example of the type content expected.]

As the report is developed, the generic [TAILORING ADVICE] text and examples should be replaced with material that applies to the specific life-cycle review.

General Tailoring Guidelines

This section includes general tailoring guidelines applicable to the whole document. Specific recommendations are included in applicable sections.

The length and level of detail of the report should be commensurate with the scope and complexity of the project. Section headings may be added where necessary, but existing headings should not be modified or deleted.

Finally, in the target report, this entire page should be deleted.

See the following address for samples of previous FSW Review Panel Summaries:

<http://fsw.gsfc.nasa.gov/internal/missiondocs.html>

This table shows the update history for the template.

Version	Date	Description	Affected Pages
0.2	10/29/04	Incorporation of Elaine's suggestions	All
0.1	10/25/04	Initial Version	All

[October 22, 2004]

TO: [Code/Mission Acronym] Project Manager/ [Project Manager Name]

CC: [List names and titles of people that should receive a copy of this summary. Include Branch Management/582]

FROM: [Code/Review Panel Chair Name,] Review Panel Chair

SUBJECT: [Mission Acronym] Flight Software [Review name]

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The [Mission Acronym] Flight Software [Review Name] was conducted on [Review Date(s)] at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt Maryland, Building [Building Number], [Room Number].

The review was led by [Mission Acronym] Flight Software [Review Lead Role (e.g., PDL)], [Review Lead Name], and was attended by an Independent Review Panel as well as key [Mission Acronym] Project management and engineering personnel.

[Summarize the Review Panel's impression of the review in a few sentences. Cover the following topics:

- Overall quality of the review
- Number and severity of Requests For Action (RFAs)
- Issues/concerns
- Whether or not the review objectives were met
- Whether or not the team is ready to proceed]

REVIEW PANEL COMPOSITION

The [Mission Acronym] Flight Software [Review Name] Independent Review Panel consisted of the following personnel:

Name	Expertise	Organization
Jane Doe	Senior FSW Engineer, Review Panel Chair	Code 582
John Doe	Software Quality Assurance Engineer	ABC Corp.
	Add rows as necessary	

REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

The following key Project Management, Systems Engineering, and Subsystem experts also participated in the review (this attendance list includes the Independent Review Team members, and presenters):

Name	Org.	Phone	E-mail Address
			Add rows as necessary

AGENDA

[Use the following statement as is, or tailor it if any large deviations from the published schedule occurred:]

The Agenda publicized prior to the review was covered essentially in its entirety as follows (some rearranging of elements to accommodate schedules did occur):

Day 1 – [Wednesday, October 6]		
Time	Review Element	Presented by
8:30am	Introduction	Jane Doe
	Add rows as necessary	
Day 2 – [Thursday, October 7]		
Time	Review Element	Presented by
8:30am	Main Processor C&DH FSW	John Doe
	Add rows as necessary	

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF OBSERVATIONS

[Describe the highlights of the review. This section can go into more technical detail than the Executive Summary, and is typically longer. Two pages would be a typical length. Bulleted paragraphs are acceptable. See the URL on the Instructions page for a link to mission examples.]

SUMMARY OF REQUESTS FOR ACTION

The following Requests for Action (RFAs) were submitted against the subject Review:

RFA #	Originator	Org.	Phone	Summary Description
1	John Doe	ABC Corp.	123-456-7890	Maintaining different images for a redundant box requires extra testing and makes CM more difficult.
				Add rows as necessary

CONCLUSION

[The conclusion should state that the team is/is not ready to proceed to the next life-cycle phase, together with supporting rationale.

Example:

The review was very professionally conducted and was very detailed. The number of RFAs is not excessive given the complexity of the spacecraft.

None of the above points are considered major and the panel again would like to stress that overall this was a very good review and we appreciate the obvious effort that went into putting together such a complete package. Given that the above RFAs are acted upon in a timely manner, we recommend continuation to CDR.]

If you have any questions, comments, criticisms, or additional observations, please send mail to:

[Review Panel Chair Name]@nasa.gov

[Review Panel Chair Name], Review Panel Chair